REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER AFOSR-TR- 78-1524	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) THE PRINCIPAL EIGENVALUE FOR LINEAR SECOND ORDER ELLIPTIC EQUATIONS WITH NATURAL BOUNDARY CONDITIONS .		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Interim rept.
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) Charles J. Holland		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) AFOSR-77-3286
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Purdue University Department of Mathematics West Lafayette, IN 47907		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 61102F 2304/A1
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Air Force Office of Scientific Research/NM Bolling AFB, Washington, DC 20332		12. REPORT DATE August 1978
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 16
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

We study the properties of the principal eigen-

value $\lambda*$ for the eigenvalue equation

$$-\nabla \circ (u_x a) + u_x b + cu = \lambda u \text{ in } \Omega, \qquad (1)$$

DD FORM 1473
1 JAN 73

AD A062877

DDC FILE COPY

20. Abstract continued.

with the natural boundary condition $u_x an = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. Above a is a positive definite matrix for each $x \in \overline{\Omega}$, b is a vector, and n is the exterior normal. Throughout we assume that the functions a_{ij}, b_i, c are of class $C^2(\overline{\Omega})$ and the bounded domain is of class $C^{2+\alpha}$. Then the principal eigenvalue λ^* exists and is real and all other eigenvalues λ satisfy $Re\ \lambda \geq \lambda^*$, see [16]. Here a characterization of the principal eigenvalue is derived motivated by ideas from stochastic control theory. This characterization was derived earlier by Donsker-Varadhan [6] using different methods. The stochastic control theory interpretation suggests a possible numerical scheme for determining the principal eigenvalue and eigenfunction for (1), and this interpretation also gives a new characterization of the smallest eigenvalue for Schrodinger's equation. Finally we study the behavior of the principal eigenvalue λ^ϵ as $\epsilon \downarrow 0$ when $a = \epsilon I$ both for the Neumann boundary condition $\frac{\partial u}{\partial n} = 0$ and the mixed condition $\frac{\partial u}{\partial n} + \alpha^2 u = 0$. The above results are only outlined here. Some of these results have appeared in [10], [12].

AFOSR-TR- 78-1524

The Principal Eigenvalue for Linear Second

Order Elliptic Equations with Natural

Boundary Conditions

Charles J. Holland
Purdue University

August 1978

Accompanying Statement

This paper is a summary of an invited talk presented at
the International Conference on Stochastic Analysis, April 10-14,
1978, at Northwestern University. This paper will appear in
the proceedings of that conference. The talk consists of two
main parts. First, we presents our recent work on the characteri-
zation of the principal eigenvalue. We have been able to derive
a new characterization of the principal eigenvalue for second order
linear elliptic partial differential equations, not necessarily
self-adjoint, with both natural and Dirichlet boundary conditions,
and also give a new alternative numerical method for calculating
both the principal eigenvalue and corresponding eigenvector in the
case of natural boundary conditions. The principal eigenvalue,
if appropriate sign changes are made, determines the stability
of equilibrium solutions to certain second order nonlinear partial
differential equations. The corresponding eigenvector enables one
to determine the first approximation of the solution of the non-
linear equation to variations of the initial condition from the
equilibrium solution. These nonlinear equations are important in

78 12 21 079

the applications. For these reasons it is important to have these characterizations of the principal eigenvalue and eigenvector.

Our method converts the determination of the eigenvalue and eigenvector to determining the solution of a stationary stochastic control problem. This latter problem is solved and from it a numerical scheme arises naturally. This method appears to have applications in solving other problems.

Secondly, we report recent progress on determining the asymptotic behavior of the principal eigenvalue for some singularly perturbed eigenvalue problems as a small nuisance parameter tends to zero. The principal eigenvalue is the optimal value for a singularly perturbed stationary stochastic control problem. We are thus able to determine the asymptotic behavior of the optimal value of certain stationary stochastic control problems.

78 12 21 079

THE PRINCIPAL EIGENVALUE FOR LINEAR SECOND ORDER ELLIPTIC EQUATIONS WITH NATURAL BOUNDARY CONDITIONS

Charles J. Holland[1,2]

Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences
New York University
New York City, N.Y.

I.   INTRODUCTION

We study the properties of the principal eigen-value λ^* for the eigenvalue equation

$$-\nabla \cdot (u_x a) + u_x b + cu = \lambda u \text{ in } \Omega, \qquad (1)$$

with the natural boundary condition $u_x an = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. Above a is a positive definite matrix for each $x \in \overline{\Omega}$, b is a vector, and n is the exterior normal. Throughout we assume that the functions a_{ij}, b_i, c are of class $C^2(\overline{\Omega})$ and the bounded do-main is of class $C^{2+\alpha}$. Then the principal eigenvalue λ^* exists and is real and all other eigenvalues λ

satisfy $\text{Re } \lambda \geq \lambda^*$, see [16]. Here a characterization of the principal eigenvalue is derived motivated by ideas from stochastic control theory. This characterization was derived earlier by Donsker-Varadhan [6] using different methods. The stochastic control theory interpretation suggests a possible numerical scheme for determining the principal eigenvalue and eigenfunction for (1), and this interpretation also gives a new characterization of the smallest eigenvalue for Schrodinger's equation. Finally we study the behavior of the principal eigenvalue λ^ε as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ when $a = \varepsilon I$ both for the Neumann boundary condition $\frac{\partial u}{\partial n} = 0$ and the mixed condition $\frac{\partial u}{\partial n} + \alpha^2 u = 0$. The above results are only outlined here. Some of these results have appeared in [10], [12].

II. CHARACTERIZATION

Define

$$F(\phi,V) = \phi_x a \phi_x^T + c\phi^2 + b^T(4a)^{-1}b\phi^2 - \frac{1}{2}\text{ div } b\ \phi^2$$
$$-\frac{1}{2}[(2a)^{-1}b - V_x^T]^T(2a)[(2a)^{-1}b - V_x^T]\phi^2. \quad (2)$$

<u>Theorem 1</u>. λ^* satisfies

$$\lambda^* = \min_{\phi \in \Phi}\ \max_{V \in C^1(\Omega)}\ [\int_\Omega F(\phi,V)dx + \int_{\partial\Omega}\frac{1}{2}(b\cdot n)\phi^2 ds] \quad (3)$$

where Φ is the set of functions ϕ of class $C^2(\Omega) \cap C(\overline{\Omega})$ with $\phi^2 > 0$ in Π and

$\int \phi^2 = 1$. Note that whenever $(2a)^{-1}b$ is a gradient, then V in (3) is chosen so that $V_x = (2a)^{-1}b$. In particular when $b = 0$ (3) reduces to Rayleigh-Ritz.

As we remarked earlier Donsker-Varadhan [6] utilizing their powerful methods established the analogue of (3) for the Dirichlet problem. Their method can be extended to cover this case. We established the formula (3) using stochastic control theory methods in [12] and outlined how to establish the result also for the Dirichlet problem.

Let us outline our derivation of (3). If λ^*, $u^* > 0$ represent the principal eigenvalue and normalized eigenfunction, then (1) can be rewritten as

$$-\text{tr } au^*_{xx} + u^*_x(b+d) + cu^* = \lambda^* u^* \qquad (4)$$

for an appropriate vector function d. Now $u^* > 0$ in $\bar{\Omega}$. Define $u^* = \exp(-\psi)$, then ψ satisfies the equation

$$\text{tr } a\psi_{xx} - \psi_x a\psi_x^T - \psi_x(b+d) + c = \lambda^* \qquad (5)$$

with the boundary condition $\psi_x an = 0$. We recognize that (5) is the Hamilton-Jacobi equation for a stationary stochastic control problem and that it can be rewritten as

$$\text{tr } a\psi_{xx} + \min_{v \in R^n} [\psi_x v + (b+d+v)(4a)^{-1}(b+d+v) + c] = \lambda^* \qquad (6)$$

A similar stochastic control theory interpretation

has been derived independently by Fleming [8] to obtain some Ventsel-Freidlin estimates.

The stochastic control problem is the following. For each Lipschitz function w, let p_w be the invariant measure associated with the Ito stochastic differential equation

$$d\xi = w(\xi)dt + \sigma(\xi)dz(t), \quad \sigma\sigma^T = 2a, \qquad (7)$$

with reflection in the direction $-an$ at the boundary. With each control w associate the cost

$$C(w) = \int_\Omega [(b+d+w)(4a)^{-1}(b+d+w)+c]p_w \, dx. \qquad (8)$$

Then $\lambda^* = \underset{w}{\text{Min }} C(w)$. Since the min in (6) is obtained when $w = -b - d + 2(u^*)^{-1}(u_x^* a)^T$, then the $\text{Min } C(w)$ can be restricted to $\mathscr{W} = \{w: w = -b-d+2u^{-1}(u_x a)^T, \int u^2 = 1, u \in C^2(\Omega) \cap C(\overline{\Omega})\}$.

Now the representation (3) is obtained by discovering the relationship between w and p_w for $w \in \mathscr{W}$. For any w, p_w satisfies the Fokker-Planck equation and boundary condition

$$\nabla \cdot [(p_x a)^T - p(d+w)] = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

$$((p_x a) - p(d+w)^T) \cdot n = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \qquad (9)$$

A little work shows that every $w \in \mathscr{W}$ can be written as

$$w = -d + 2u^{-1}(u_x a)^T + (-b+2(W_x a)^T) \qquad (10)$$

where $p_w = u^2$ and u, W satisfy

$$\nabla \cdot (u^2(-b + 2(W_x a)^T) = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega$$

$$(-b^T + 2W_x a) \cdot n = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega. \tag{11}$$

Now W minimizes

$$I(V) = \int_\Omega ((2a)^{-1}b - V_x^T)^T (2a)((2a)^{-1}b - V_x^T) u^2 dx. \tag{12}$$

Substituting (10) into (8) and using the fact that W minimizes (12), one obtains the representation (3). This concludes the outline of the proof.

Corollary 1. $\underset{\phi \ C^1(\overline{\Omega})}{\text{Min Max}} = \underset{C^1(\overline{\Omega}) \ \phi}{\text{Max Min}}$ in (3).

We shall outline a proof of this fact below. Note that the interchange of Min and Max gives the representation

$$\lambda^* = \underset{V \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})}{\text{Min}} \ \mu(V)$$

where $\mu(V)$ is the smallest eigenvalue to

$$-\text{tr } a\phi_{xx} + M(V)\phi = \mu\phi \text{ in } \Omega, \tag{14}$$

$$M(V) = c + b^T(4a)^{-1}b - \frac{1}{2} \text{ div } b$$
$$-\frac{1}{2}[(2a)^{-1}b - V_x^T]^T (2a)[(2a)^{-1}b - V_x^T],$$

with the boundary condition $\phi_x an + \frac{1}{2}(b \cdot n)\phi^2 = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. It is not necessary that $\frac{1}{2}(b \cdot n) \geq 0$ to guarantee existence of the smallest eigenvalue. Now the fact that Min Max = Inf Sup = Sup Inf follows from the fact that the functional in (3) is strictly concave in V if we require the additional assumption that $V(0) = 0$. Convexity in the argument ϕ^2 follows from the following lemma which is the obvious modifi-

cation of Lemma 2.2 in Donsker-Varadhan [6]. Note
that if $q = \phi^2$, then $\int (q_x a q_x^T) q^{-1} dx = \int 4\phi_x a \phi_x^T$.

Lemma 1. Let $\mathcal{U} = \{p: p \in C^2(\Omega) \cap C^1(\overline{\Omega}), \quad p > 0$ in $\overline{\Omega}, \quad p_x an = 0$ on $\partial\Omega\}$. If

$q \in \mathcal{U}$, then $\int_{\Omega} (q_x a q_x^T) q^{-1} dx = -\inf_{p \in \mathcal{U}} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\nabla \cdot (p_x a)}{p} q dx.$

Convexity in ϕ^2, concavity in V is sufficient
to guarantee that Inf Sup = Sup Inf, see Theorem 4.1
in Sion [17]. The fact that Sup Inf = Max Min
follows from the fact that $\mu(V)$ exists and Remark
2.3, p. 175 in Ekeland-Temam [7].

III. SCHRÖDINGER'S EQUATION

In [10] we considered the Schrödinger equation
$$ih \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = H\psi \tag{15}$$
in bounded domains under the cases of periodic, zero
Dirichlet, and zero Neumann boundary conditions. In
(15) $H = -(h^2/2m)\Delta_x + K$, h is Planck's constant
divided by 2π, and $K \geq 0$ is the potential function.
Let us discuss only the Neumann case here. We look
for solutions of (15) of the form
$\psi(t,x) = \phi(x) \cdot \exp(-i\lambda h^{-1} t)$ in Ω satisfying $\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial n} = 0$
on $\partial\Omega$. Then ϕ satisfies
$$H\phi = \lambda\phi. \tag{16}$$
Let λ^* denote the smallest eigenvalue of (16)

and $\phi*$ the corresponding normalized eigenfunction.
We now formulate a stochastic control problem for
$\lambda*$, $\phi*$. Define $\phi* = \exp(-Q/h)$. Then Q satisfies
the equation

$$\frac{h}{2m} \Delta_x Q + \min_w [Q_x w + \frac{1}{2}m|w|^2 + K] = \lambda* \qquad (17)$$

For each control function v let p_v be the in-
variant density p_v generated by the diffusion pro-
cess

$$d\xi = v(\xi)dt + (h/m)^{1/2}dz(t) \qquad (18)$$

with reflection in the interior normal direction.
Associate with each control v, the cost

$$C(v) = \int_\Omega [\frac{1}{2}m|v|^2 + K]p_v \, dx. \qquad (19)$$

Theorem 2. $\lambda* = \text{Min}_v C(v)$ where the minimum is taken
over Lipschitz functions $v: \bar{\Omega} \to R^n$. The minimum is
obtained when $v = (h/m)(\phi_x*/\phi*)$ and $p_v = (\phi*)^2$.

Note that v plays the role of "velocity" of the
process (18). Thus $\lambda*$ can be thought of as the
minimum energy of (19) and $(\phi*)^2$ as the invariant
probability distribution of the process. This inter-
pretation corresponds to the standard physical inter-
pretations. See Nelson [15] for another approach to
(15) using stochastic differential equations. Of
course, the interpretation (18), (19) for the self-
adjoint problem $H\phi = \lambda\phi$ is Rayleigh-Ritz in disguise.

IV.   NUMERICAL APPROXIMATIONS

The control theory interpretation in Section 2
also suggests an alternative numerical method for
approximating the principal eigenvalue and eigen-
function for the Neumann problem (1).   The procedure
is to discretize the verification equation (6) ob-
taining the verification equations for stationary
control of a Markov chain.   The Markov chain problem
is the discrete analogue of the stochastic control
problem associated with (6).   The Markov chain control
problem has a special form which can be solved effi-
ciently using an iterative method due to White [19].
See [10], Section 3 for details.   We have done some
numerical work on simple examples using this method,
however, the convergence of this method has not been
justified theoretically.

This type of numerical approximation can also be
used for the periodic eigenvalue problem.   However,
the formal approximation suggested in [10] for the
Dirichlet problem fails.

V.   SINGULARLY PERTURBED PROBLEMS

Here the asymptotic behavior as $\epsilon \downarrow 0$ of the
principal eigenvalue to the singularly perturbed eigen-
value problem

$$-\varepsilon\Delta\phi - \phi_x(b(x)+\varepsilon\tilde{b}(x)) + ((c(x)+\varepsilon\tilde{c}(x))\phi = \lambda\phi \quad (20)$$

in a bounded convex domain Ω with boundary data $\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial n} + \alpha(x)\phi = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ is studied. The behavior of λ^ε has been extensively studied for the Dirichlet problem with $c = 0$; see the papers [3], [9], [18]. There the behavior can vary from $\lambda^\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ to $\lambda^\varepsilon \rightarrow \infty$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ depending upon the nature of the vector field b. For the zero Neumann problem such a wide range of behavior is not possible since one knows that $\min_{x\in\bar{\Omega}}(c(x)+\varepsilon\tilde{c}(x)) \leq \lambda^\varepsilon \leq \max_{x\in\bar{\Omega}}(c(x)+\varepsilon\tilde{c}(x))$. However, the behavior of the principal eigenvalue for Neumann and mixed problems is of interest, especially in the stability analysis of equilibrium states of nonlinear diffusion processes occurring in chemical reactors. See H. Keller [14] who treats the eigenvalue problem in one spatial dimension by transforming the problem to the standard self-adjoint Sturmian form.

The problem with the zero Neumann condition $\frac{\partial u}{\partial n} = 0$ is treated first. The mixed problem with $\alpha \not\equiv 0$ will then be solved by transforming the mixed problem into a Neumann problem. The properties of the principal eigenvalue λ^ε depend upon the nature of the vector field $b + \varepsilon\tilde{b}$, as is evident from (7)-(8). We need the following definition. Throughout let $\xi_x^0(t)$ be the solution to the differential equation

$$d\xi_x^o(t) = b(\xi_x^o(t))dt, \; \xi_x^o(0) = x \in \overline{\Omega} \qquad (21)$$

with reflection. Reflection means that if $y \in \partial\Omega$ and $b(y) \cdot n(y) \geq 0$, n the exterior normal as before, then $\xi_y^o(t)$ travels along the boundary with velocity equal to the projection of b on the tangent space to Ω at $\xi_y^o(t)$. Otherwise $\xi_y^o(t)$ is the solution to (21). This prevents the path from escaping from $\overline{\Omega}$. See Bensoussan-Lions [2] or Holland [11] for a more detailed discussion of the path.

First, the self-adjoint case $b = \tilde{b}$ is disposed of.

Lemma 2. If $b = \tilde{b} = 0$, then $\lambda^\epsilon \to \min_{x \in \overline{\Omega}} c(x)$ as $\epsilon \downarrow 0$.

Proof: This follows immediately from the Rayleigh-Ritz representation.

Theorem 3. Suppose that the equation (21) with re-flection has a globally (for all x in $\overline{\Omega}$) asymptotically stable rest point $\overline{x}$. Then $\lambda^\epsilon \to c(\overline{x})$ as $\epsilon \downarrow 0$.

Remark. A rest point $\overline{x}$ is a point in $\overline{\Omega}$ such that $\xi_{\overline{x}}^o(t) = \overline{x}$ for all t. If $\overline{x} \in \Omega$, then $b(\overline{x}) = 0$. If $\overline{x} \in \overline{\Omega}$, then either $b(\overline{x}) = 0$ or else $b(\overline{x})$ is parallel to $n(\overline{x})$.

Outline of proof: Let λ^ϵ denote the principal eigen-value and $\phi^\epsilon > 0$ the corresponding eigenfunction. Define

$$u^\varepsilon(x,t) = \phi^\varepsilon(x)e^{-\lambda^\varepsilon t}. \tag{22}$$

Then u^ε satisfies

$$\varepsilon\Delta u + u_x(b+\varepsilon\tilde{b}) - (c+\varepsilon\tilde{c})u - u_t = 0 \tag{23}$$

with the boundary condition $\frac{\partial u}{\partial n} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega\times[0,\infty)$.
Then using the Ito differential rule we have that

$$u^\varepsilon(x,t) = E\phi(\xi_x^\varepsilon(t))\exp\int_0^t -c(\xi_x^\varepsilon(s))ds \tag{24}$$

where $\xi_x^\varepsilon(t)$ is the solution to the Ito equation

$$d\xi_x^\varepsilon(t) = (b+\varepsilon\tilde{b})(\xi_x^\varepsilon(t))dt + (2\varepsilon)^{1/2}dz(t), \xi_x^\varepsilon(0) = x, \tag{25}$$

$z(t)$ Brownian motion as before, with reflection in the interior normal direction at the boundary of $\partial\Omega$. See [2] for a construction of the process.

The proof is then completed using the representations (22) and (24) for sufficiently large t. This type of approach follows ideas of Kac [13]. The proof requires the estimate that in convex domains

$$\Pr_{0 \leq t \leq t'} [\|\xi_x^\varepsilon(\cdot) - \xi_x^0(\cdot)\| > \mu] \to 0$$

as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ for any fixed $\mu > 0$. This estimate is derived in [11] (see equation (15) there) and depends upon estimates (3.13), (3.14) in [2] for reflecting processes in convex domains.

Example. If Ω is the unit disc in R^2 and $b = (b_1, b_2) = (1, -x_2^2)$, then $\lambda^\varepsilon \to c(1,0)$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$.

Theorem 4. Suppose that the differential equation (21)

with reflection has a limit cycle Γ whose domain of attraction consists of all of $\bar{\Omega}$ except for isolated critical points in Ω. Further, at a critical point x^* assume that the eigenvalues of $b_x(x^*)$ have only positive real parts. Then

$$\lambda^\epsilon \to \frac{1}{T^*} \int_0^{T^*} c(\xi_{\bar{x}}^0(t))dt \quad \text{as} \quad \epsilon \downarrow 0$$

where T^* is the period of Γ and $\bar{x}$ is an arbitrary point on Γ.

Proof: The proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 3 except one has the added complication of possible critical points x^*.

We now consider the mixed problem for the cases considered in Theorems 3 and 4.

Theorem 5. Let H be a smooth solution to $\Delta H - H = 0$ in Ω with $\frac{\partial H}{\partial n} = \alpha$ on $\partial\Omega$. Suppose b satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 3. Then $\lambda^\epsilon \to c(\bar{x}) + \nabla H(\bar{x}) \cdot b(\bar{x})$ as $\epsilon \downarrow 0$. Suppose b satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 4. Then

$$\lambda^\epsilon \to \frac{1}{T^*} \int_0^{T^*} c(\xi_{\bar{x}}^0(t)) + \nabla H(\xi_{\bar{x}}^0(t)) \cdot b(\xi_{\bar{x}}^0(t))dt \quad \text{as} \quad \epsilon \downarrow 0.$$

Proof: The result follows by considering the eigenvalue problem for $v = e^{H(x)}u$.

Example. The limits for λ^ϵ in Theorem 5 can be evaluated in the following case. Suppose $\Omega \subset R^n$ and b satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 3 with

$\bar{x} \in \partial\Omega$. Then $b(\bar{x}) = |b(\bar{x})| n(\bar{x})$ and hence $\lambda^{\epsilon} \to c(\bar{x}) + \alpha(\bar{x})|b(\bar{x})|$. Thus if $\Omega = (0,1)$, $b > 0$ on $[0,1]$, then $\lambda^{\epsilon} \to c(1) + \alpha(1)b(1)$ as $\epsilon \downarrow 0$. This last remark is the content of the limit result (1.7) in [14].

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author would like to thank S. R. S. Varadhan for some stimulating discussions.

REFERENCES

1. Anderson, R., Orey, S., Small random perturbations of dynamical systems with reflecting boundary, Proc. Symposium Pure Math. Vol. XXXI, Univ. Ill., 1976, pp. 1-4, American Math Soc.
2. Bensoussan, A., Lions, J., Diffusion processes in bounded domains and singular perturbation problems for variational inequalities with Neumann boundary conditions in Probabilistic Methods in Differential Equations, Springer Verlag Lecture Notes in Mathematics #451(1975), 8-25.
3. Devinatz, A., Ellis, R., Friedman, A., The asymptotic behavior of the first real eigenvalue of second order elliptic operators with a small parameter in the highest derivatives II, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 23(1974) 991-1011.
4. Devinatz, A., Friedman, A., Asymptotic behavior of the principal eigenfunction for a singularly perturbed Dirichlet problem, preprint.
5. Donsker, M., Varadhan, S. R. S., Asymptotic evaluation of certain Wiener integrals for large time, in Proceedings of the International Conference on Integration in function spaces, Clarendon Press, Oxford (1974) 82-88.
6. Donsker, M., Varadhan, S. R. S., On the principal eigenvalue of second order differential operators, Comm. Pure. Appl. Math. 29(1976) 595-621.

7. Ekeland, I., Teman, R., Convex Analysis and Variational Problems. North-Holland (1976).

8. Fleming, W., Exit probabilities and optimal stochastic control, preprint.

9. Friedman, A., The asymptotic behavior of the first real eigenvalue of a second order elliptic operator with a small parameter in the highest derivatives, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 22(1973) 1005-1015.

10. Holland, C., A new energy characterization of the smallest eigenvalue of the Schrödinger equation Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 30(1977) 755-765.

11. Holland, C., The regular expansion in the Neumann problem for elliptic equations Comm. in Partial Differential Equations 1(1976) 191-213.

12. Holland, C., A minimum principle for the smallest eigenvalue for second order linear elliptic equations with natural boundary conditions, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., to appear.

13. Kac, M., On some connections between probability theory and differential and integral equations, Proc. of the 2nd Bekeley Symposium (1950) pp. 189-215.

14. Keller, H., Stability theory for multiple equilibrium states of a nonlinear diffusion process, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 4(1973) 134-140.

15. Nelson, E., Dynamical Theories of Brownian Motion, Princeton University Press, 1967.

16. Protter, M., Weinberger, H., On the spectrum of general second order operators, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 72(1966) 251-255.

17. Sion, M., On general minimax theorem, Pac. J. Math. 8(1958) 171-176.

18. Ventsel, A.,Freidlin, M., On small random perturbations of dynamical systems, Russ. Math. Surveys 25(1970) 1-56, Uspekhi Math. Nauk, 28(1970) 3-55.

19. White,D., Dynamic programming, Markov chains, and the method of successive approximations, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 6(1963) 373-376.